



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,543	11/30/2001	Rae K. Burns	50277-1774 (OID 2001-090-	1004
29989	7590	03/22/2005	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			CHEN, CHONGSHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,543

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications filed on 22 October 2004. Claims 1-40 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. The declaration and Exhibit A, B, C and D filed on 22 October 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 have been considered but are ineffective to overcome the *Ayi et al.* (Pub. No.: 2002/0143735 A1).

First, the declaration is defective because the declaration is not signed by all the inventors [See MPEP 704, 715].

Second, applicants are relying on actual reduction to practice prior to the reference date to antedate the reference. In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose [MPEP 715.07]. However, no such evidence has been supplied. Exhibit A, B, C and D do not qualify as evidence because they do not have date and time to prove the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose prior to the reference date.

Moreover, applicants rely on various written descriptions to prove reduction to practice. Written description alone does not constitute an actual reduction to practice. Because applicants rely solely on the documents describing the invention, no reduction to practice has been shown. Note, that such documentation may support conception.

Furthermore, a general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. *Ex parte Saunders*, 1883 C.D. 23. 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883).

Art Unit: 2162

Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). *In re Borkowski*, 505 F2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F2d at 718-19. 184 USPQ at 33. See also *In re Harry*, 33 F2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.") [MPEP 715.07].

The declaration submitted by the applicants are just a general allegation that the establish conception and reduction to practice of the invention prior to the Aji reference. Applicants do not point out any concrete evidence in the declaration for the claimed invention. For example, the limitations "determining which policies, of the plurality of label-based policies, apply to the table based on a policy set of one or more policies associated with the table" in the claim 1 are not mapped to corresponding portions of the applicants' submitted declaration and the examiner does not find sufficient support in the declaration for the aforementioned claim limitations. Therefore, the declaration is ineffective to overcome the Aji reference.

3. As per applicant's arguments regarding Hayman does not teach registering, with a

database management system a package that includes an access mediation routine and invoking the access mediation routine to determine whether to allow operation on data in the first table have been considered but are not persuasive. Hayman teaches a security system that provides access control and places security labels on each data or other system resource, and on each user process. A hierarchy of labels is created ranging from highly secret to commonly accessible and strict policies are enforced by the security system based on these labels to determine who has what type of access to which data files or other system resource (Hayman, col. 1, lines 49 – col. 2, line 8, col. 5, lines 18-60). The security system allows each process to be assigned a set of capabilities (or privileges) which it can invoke during its existence ... For example, the user may decide to change his password. To do this, the user must update the system files which store his password and other associated information. However, the user is not usually allowed access to these files, so the change password program must provide the ability to access these files. The program is responsible for ensuring that the extra capabilities are only used for the purpose for which they were intended, and the extra capabilities are automatically removed when the change password program terminates (Hayman, col. 2, line 45 – col. 3, line 8). Clearly, the security program, such as the change password program, is registered with the database management system, and implements a package of security routines and policies, such as asking the user to enter a new password, receiving the new password, accessing the password file, changing the old password to the new password, and terminating the change password program. Furthermore, Hayman teaches a reference monitor that mediates all the requests for access to an object by a subject, and thus controls whether, and to what extent, the subject is granted access to the object (Hayman, col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 4). Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayi et al. (hereinafter "Ayi", Pub. No.: US 2002/0143735) in view of Hart (5,787,428).

As per claim 1, Ayi teaches a method for managing access to data in a database subject to a plurality of label-based security policies, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, within a database management system, a request for performing an operation set of one or more operations on data in a table of the database (Ayi, page 1, [0006] - [0008]);

determining which policies, of the plurality of label-based policies, apply to the table based on a policy set of one or more policies associated with the table (Ayi, page 1, [0006] - [0008]).

Ayi discloses determining whether to perform an operation/access on a dataset based on the label associated with the dataset (Ayi, page 1, [0006]). Ayi does not explicitly disclose whether to perform the operation on a row of the table. Hart teaches determining whether to perform the operation on a row of the table based on a set of labels associated with the row (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the access control system of Ayi by incorporating determining whether to perform the operation on a row of the table based on a set

Art Unit: 2162

of labels associated with the row as disclosed by Hart (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19). The motivation being to provide different security level and access management for different rows in the table.

As per claim 2, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teach adding a policy column to the table for each policy in the policy set associated with the table (Hart, Fig. 4).

As per claim 3, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach storing a label, of the set of labels associated with the row, in a corresponding policy column of the row (Hart, Fig. 4).

As per claim 4, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said step of determining which policies apply further comprising the step of determining whether a column is a policy column (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19).

As per claim 5, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teach the policy set associated with the table includes two or more policies of the plurality of label-based policies (Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008], Hart, Fig. 4-8).

Claims 21-25 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-5.

6. Claims 6-20 and 26-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayman et al. (hereinafter "Hayman", 5,859,966) in view of Ayi et al. (hereinafter "Ayi", Pub. No.: US 2002/0143735 A1).

As per claim 6, Hayman discloses a method for managing access to data in on a policy set of one or more label-based security policies, the method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2162

Registering one or more packages of routines, wherein each package of said one or more packages implements a security model that supports a model set of one or more policies of the policy set and said each package includes an access mediation routine (Hayman, col. 1, line 53 – col. 3, line 8, col. 5, lines 18 – col. 60);

associating a first policy of a first model set in a first package with an object (Hayman, col. 5, lines 18-60, Hayman teaches labels/policies are applied to each object. Please note the labels are plural, which inherently includes a first policy, a second policy, etc); and

invoking the access mediation routine in the first package to determining whether to allow operation on data based on the first policy (Hayman, col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 4).

Hayman teaches the security policy is applied to an object, however, Hayman does not explicitly disclose the object is a first table within the database system. Ayi teaches applies labels to tables in the database system (Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the security system of Hayman by applying the labels/policies to tables in the database system as disclosed by Ayi. The motivation being to control access to the data in a table of the database system.

As per claim 7, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach forming said each package of said one or more packages so that the access mediation routine conforms to a specified interface for enforcing a policy in the database management system (Hayman, col. 9, lines 1-13).

As per claim 8, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further teach said each package further comprising including one or more

Art Unit: 2162

administrative routines for defining a policy for the model set (Hayman, col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 4).

As per claim 9, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 8, and further teach one or more administrative routines for defining a policy further comprising including one or more administrative routines for defining a name for a particular policy; labels for the particular policy; descriptions for the labels; and properties for the labels (Hayman, col. 5, lines 18-60).

As per claim 10, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach invoking an administrative routine of the first package for defining the first policy (Hayman, col. 5, lines 18-60).

As per claim 11, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, and further teach invoking the administrative routine of the first package further comprising providing to the administrative routine of the first package a plurality of parameters including a policy name for the first policy and a plurality of label names for labels of the first policy (Hayman, col. 5, lines 18-60, col. 6, lines 45-67).

As per claim 12, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach in response to attempts to operate on data in a row in the table, the step of determining that the first policy applies to the table (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-39, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 13, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach associating a second policy of a second model set in a second package with a second table within the database system; and invoking the access mediation routine in the

second package for determining whether to allow operation on data in the second table based on the second policy (Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 14, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second model in the second package is the same as the first model in the first package (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 15, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second model in the second package is different from the first model in the first package (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 16, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teaches the second table is the same as the first table (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 17, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second table is different from the first table (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 18, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach invoking the access mediation routine in the first package further comprising providing data indicating the first policy to the access mediation routine (Hayman, col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 4).

As per claim 19, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach the method further comprises the step of determining a set of allowed labels for the first policy for a user of the database management system; said step of invoking the access mediation routine is performed during said step of determining the set of allowed labels;

Art Unit: 2162

and the user is allowed to operate on the data according to the first policy if the data is associated with a label for the first policy and the label is included in the set of allowed labels for the first policy (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, col. 9, line 55 – col. 10, line 4).

As per claim 20, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 19, and further teach storing the set of allowed labels in a session cache for a communication session between the database management system and the user (Hayman, col. 8, lines 54-67, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

Claims 26-40 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 6-20.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-4031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571)272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chongshan Chen
March 16, 2005



JEAN M. CARRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER